UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/577,886	04/28/2006	Bahaa Botros Seedhom	7881.24 2243		
21999 KIRTON AND	7590 01/08/200 MCCONKIE	9	EXAMINER		
60 EAST SOUT		STEWART, JASON-DENNIS NEILKEN			
SUITE 1800 SALT LAKE C	TTY, UT 84111	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			3738		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/08/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application	n No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/577,88	6	SEEDHOM ET AL		
		Examiner		Art Unit		
		JASON-DE	ENNIS STEWART	3738		
The MAILING D. Period for Reply	ATE of this communication	n appears on the	cover sheet with the o	correspondence ad	dress	
WHICHEVER IS LONG - Extensions of time may be averafter SIX (6) MONTHS from the lift NO period for reply is specionally and the set in the set	UTORY PERIOD FOR RIBER, FROM THE MAILIN allable under the provisions of 37 CF are mailing date of this communicatio fied above, the maximum statutory prorextended period for reply will, by soce later than three months after the late. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	IG DATE OF TH FR 1.136(a). In no eve on. period will apply and will statute, cause the appl	IS COMMUNICATION Int, however, may a reply be tind Expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cation to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this co ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status						
2a)⊠ This action is FII 3)□ Since this applic	ommunication(s) filed on <u>a</u> NAL. 2b) ation is in condition for alleance with the practice under	This action is no owance except	on-final. for formal matters, pro		merits is	
Disposition of Claims						
4a) Of the above 5) ☐ Claim(s) i 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>21-40</u> is 7) ☐ Claim(s) i		hdrawn from cor				
<u> </u>						
10) The drawing(s) fil Applicant may not Replacement draw	is objected to by the Exampled on is/are: a) request that any objection to ring sheet(s) including the contration is objected to by the	accepted or b)[the drawing(s) borrection is require	e held in abeyance. Seed if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CF	, ,	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. ६	§ 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited 2) Notice of Draftsperson's P. 3) Information Disclosure Sta Paper No(s)/Mail Date	atent Drawing Review (PTO-948	8)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate		

Art Unit: 3738

DETAILED ACTION

The following is a Final Office action in response to communications received on 10/24/2008. Claims 1-21 have been cancelled. Claims 22-40 have been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 1. Claims 22-32 and 34, 39, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Seedhom et al. 2003/0135209 in view of Bonutti 6,117,160 further in view of Schwartz et al. 7,163,563.
- 2. Regarding Claim 18, Seedhom teaches a method of repair or damaged tissue comprising forming a narrow groove into the bone, replacing damaged tissue with a biocompatible material and anchoring the material by a retaining means (abstract). Seedhom also discloses removing damaged tissue from the groove (Fig. 21) and the groove extending into the bone (Fig. 15). Seedhom also discloses a reaming device (paragraph 27) and the depth of the groove being five times that of the tissue that is replaced (paragraph 79). However, Seedhom does not disclose the connecting element

being spaced apart from the pad in anchored position by a length of said connecting portions within the groove.

Bonutti discloses an elongate connecting portion element 38 capable of being pushed to slide into a groove and applying a downward force to connecting elements 50 (Fig. 12; col. 18, II. 35-55). Bonutti also discloses a retaining element 32 that provides a connection via the elongate portions 72 (Fig. 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an "array" of such connecting portions since it has been held that mere duplication of essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. *St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co.*, 193 USPQ 8.

It would have been obvious to modify the method of Seedhom using the connecting elements of Bonutti in order to secure body tissue to bone which may or may not have been fractured as taught by Bonutti (col. 1, II. 25-28) to compress tissue to promote the healing process.

Seedhom in view of Bonutti discloses the invention as disclosed and discussed above. However, although implied, Seedhom in view of Bonutti does not positively disclose an array of connection elements at or near the perimeter of the pad.

Schwartz '563 illustrates tissue repair material with an array of connecting elements 15, 17 fixed at the perimeter of the pad (fig. 28).

It would have been obvious to connect the pad of Seedhom to the retaining element of Bonutti in the manner disclosed in Schwartz '314 in order to fill the gap left by a meniscectomy as disclosed by Schwartz '563 (col. 23, II. 4-7).

Art Unit: 3738

3. Claims 33 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Seedhom et al. 2003/0135209 in view of Bonutti 6,117,160 in view of Schwartz et al. 7,163,563 in further view of Schmieding 7,264,634.

4. Seedhom in view of Bonutti in view of Schwartz the invention as claimed and as discussed above. However, Seedhom in view of Bonutti in view of Schwartz does not teach the following claimed limitation: a hollow delivery device to introduce pad and retaining element into groove.

Schmieding teaches a hollow delivery device 24 (fig. 8) and a removable tool handle (paragraph 33).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify in view of Schmieding in order to repair damaged articular joint surfaces as taught by Schmieding thus giving the surgeon the ability to work in small incisions or application sites.

- 5. Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seedhom et al. 2003/0135209 in view of Bonutti 6,117,160 in view of Schwartz et al. 7,163,563 in view of Schmieding 7,264,634 further in view of Johanson et al. 2002/0042624.
- 6. Seedhom in view of Bonutti in view of Schwartz in view of Schmieding teaches the invention as claimed and as discussed above. However, Seedhom in view of Bonutti in view of Schwartz in view of Schmieding does not teach following claimed limitation: a bearing coupling handle and delivery device.

Art Unit: 3738

Johanson teaches a bearing between the tool handle and delivery device (paragraph 54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Seedhom in view of Bonutti in view of Schwartz in view of Schwieding further in view of Johanson in order to transplant a bone plug from a donor site to a recipient site as taught by Johanson (abstract).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/24/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Bonutti is unrelated subject matter. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Bonutti discloses an orthopedic fixation device that uses the tension of elongate elements for apply a fixation force. In general, this is a mode of fixation similar to that of Applicant's device. The anchors 32 of Bonutti act in a similar fashion to the "pad" and "retaining element" of the Applicant's device and it is interpreted by the Examiner that one of the anchors 32 acts as the "retaining element" and the element is slidable depthwise into a groove (Fig. 12)

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON-DENNIS STEWART whose telephone number is (571)270-3080. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (alt Fridays off) 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Corrine McDermott can be reached on (571)272-4754. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3738

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason-Dennis Stewart/ Examiner, Art Unit 3738

/Brian E Pellegrino/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3738